New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden M. Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Secretary and Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.34	One month	$ .75
One year	12.00	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY		DAILY ONLY	
Six months	1.33	One month	.50
One year	4.68	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY		SUNDAY ONLY	
One month	1.00	One month	.50
One year	12.00	One year	4.68

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Where the British Go Wrong.

There is disclosed in all British comment on our latest note a common error, a uniform misapprehension, which, if persisted in, may lead to grave consequences, and at best will utterly prevent the British from understanding this country's temper or opinion. This error is revealed in the familiar assertion that since Great Britain is fighting the battle for civilization, which is our battle, too, the United States is unfair and unreasonable in hampering British effort by insisting on technical legal rights.

Now, the question as to whether the defeat of Germany is or is not a concern of the United States is fairly debatable. The Tribune has at all times frankly expressed its own belief that the German idea is fatal to American civilization and American ideals. It believes German defeat necessary if American democracy is to live and perform its service. But this is an individual view, and it is not the view of a majority of Americans nor of the American government.

Therefore, if the British persist in the notion that they are entitled to special consideration they will end in disaster, because there is not the smallest ground for expecting such consideration from this country as a whole or from the present Administration, which is in this respect fairly representative.

What British statesmanship must face is the fact, not the theory, of American sentiment. Again, it is of small present importance that the British believe that Americans ought to give their sympathy and lessen British difficulties by a liberal interpretation of international law. Perhaps they are right, perhaps they are wrong, but the truth is that they cannot expect such things from American sentiment or government in the existing situation. They will deceive themselves, and their friends in America will deceive them, if such a view is permitted to go unchallenged.

Take a parallel case: Early in the Civil War the Trent affair aroused American sentiment to fever heat. We were at war. We were fighting for our national existence. We in the North believed we were fighting for liberty and civilization. When we took Mason and Slidell off a British ship we acted illegally, but all over the North we hoped Great Britain would suffer the technical wrong patiently.

But Great Britain did nothing of the sort. She insisted upon her rights. She pressed the technical point. We were not in a position to fight, and we yielded. But in Boston all the leading merchants took a solemn oath never to buy British goods, wear British clothes or eat British food. The indignation in the North was extreme. The resentment endured for a long time.

Yet in the calmer years that followed Americans perceived that they had been unreasonable. They recognized that their passion was incident to the state of mind created by war. They realized that they had been in a condition of "nerves" and that the British were not to be censured for insisting on rights that were incontestable, however awkward and ungenerous the insistence.

What the British must understand now, if they are to grasp American opinion at all, is that they are in a state of "nerves," that they are asking us to surrender rights, as we asked them to surrender rights half a century ago. Quite as many British citizens sympathized with the North as there are Americans who heartily sympathize with England now. But such sympathy is not translatable into permission to destroy rights or suspend laws.

There is not the smallest profit for the British in arguing this thing. They will not make more friends; they may lose some. Conceivably they may feel it necessary to continue to invade our rights. Even the remote possibility of an embargo may seem less costly than the immediate profit of their blockade. This is for them to decide. But to reckon on American complaisance is to make a profound blunder which will lead to others.

Let us be perfectly frank in the matter. The vast majority of Americans have no appreciation of the meaning of the present conflict in human history. To them it is another war, and all wars are reprehensible and all nations engaged in them criminal. We have been permeated with the pacifist flapdoodle, just as France was twenty years ago, and it has stuck with us.

Again, beyond the Alleghanies the war is far less important than on the Atlantic seaboard. It commands less attention, gets less prominence in the newspapers and occupies a less commanding position in the intellectual life of the community. Let the British recall their own state of almost universal ignorance and bewilderment when their own nation was going to war, and they will perhaps grasp in some measure the feeling of Americans in the Middle States, five thousand conflict.

ers, which are most frequently quoted in London, are not representative of American thought in this respect, for their immediate constituencies are, by comparison, rather European than American in their interests. Englishmen are thus frequently misled as to American opinion by seeing the comment of New York newspapers, for example, which do not in the least express a national, but merely a local opinion.

The British may regret American indifference. American blindness, American lack of sympathy. They may criticise it, but what is of prime importance is that they should recognize it for what it is. And it is not an opinion on which they can base expectation for special favors or liberal application of international laws. In a word, American opinion is American opinion; it is of its own sort; it grows out of a long history, out of many years of isolation from world affairs and out of a tradition that only in such isolation is there security.

There are thousands of Americans who hope to see the Allies win. From these there is steadily flowing money; not a few of them have sent sons to fight for France or Great Britain. There is no hostility outside of the ranks of the Americans whose derivation is Teutonic. But there are millions of Americans who are as totally unconcerned as were millions of British at the time of the Civil War.

This the British must understand. The United States is officially and in the mind of the majority of its citizens neutral. It will not favor British interests at the expense of German; it will not deliberately help Great Britain to blockade Germany; it will not forego legal rights for British benefit, because, as a nation and as a people, Americans do not accept the view that either British or German success is desirable for America—or dangerous.

If Mr. Wilson had been a leader, if he had been a forceful, determined statesman, this country would have followed him to any length immediately after the Lusitania Massacre. But apart from that time there has been no considerable sentiment in favor of any action which would enlist the United States in the general world war. Many Americans bitterly regret this fact, but their regret does not change the fact, and the fact is for British statesmanship to face.

In the immediate dispute the British are saved by reason of our arbitration treaty from all danger of war. Apart from the propagandist press there is no desire or support for hostile action to assert our rights. The question of an embargo will be fully debated in Congress before it is actually settled, and no man can forecast the outcome.

But, speaking as a friend, speaking as a newspaper which is thoroughly in sympathy with the aims and purposes of both France and Great Britain in their contest with German militarism, The Tribune warns the British that it is an inexcusable and fatal blunder to persist in the notion that America sees things as the British do, accepts the British view that the war is for civilization and therefore for the future benefit of mankind. Many Americans believe this; their views are constantly reported in England, but they are a small minority of Americans, and their view will not and can not prevail.

The very best thing the British can do, if they would understand American opinion now, is to examine carefully both British action and British public opinion as expressed in the newspapers of the Civil War period. Let them recall that every Northerner, then, believed he was fighting to save his country just as implicitly as Britons now believe they are striving to save Britain. Let them remember that the North early convinced itself that the battle was being fought to end human slavery and that the war was thus a war for civilization. Let them then recall the Trent affair, in which they were in the right; the Alabama case, in which they were wholly in the wrong, and perhaps the American state of mind will be intelligible.

But whether this prove the case or not, let them recognize what American opinion is. They will thus save themselves bitter disillusionment. They will thus escape dangerous self-delusion. There is no sympathy for the Allied cause in this country which will compel or influence the President to deal gently with the British. There is no appreciation of the fact, if it be a fact, that the American future is being settled on European battlefields. This country is following its own course; it is faithful to its history and tradition in avoiding foreign entanglements, and as a country it totally rejects the notion that the war which means life or death to the British just now means anything to it. And when the Civil War was being fought out Europe adopted exactly the same policy toward us.

Inspection Which Does Not Protect.

It is evident, from the facts already of record, that the system of factory inspection imposed by the laws adopted after the Triangle fire broke down in the case of the Williamsburg establishment. Whether this was solely the fault of the two inspectors suspended, whether the fault goes higher up or whether it be inherent in the system itself ought to be established speedily as a result of some of the inquiries now under way. If under the laws especially designed to safeguard factory workers there cannot be safety, or, at least, definite responsibility for injuries and deaths, it is high time the public know it and turn to devising new ways to meet the trouble.

Certainly inspection which produces no results after months of delay is no protection. After the Triangle catastrophe the city was told that there were hundreds of firetrap factories here. The Bureau of Fire Prevention has done a tremendous lot of inspecting and issuing of remedial orders. But the public and the workers know how factory owners fight such orders, and the almost unlimited chances of delay in their favor. As things stand, the factory owners risk their money, the workers their lives. It might make the risk a little less if the authorities would issue daily lists of those establishments where unsafe conditions have been discovered and close them if, after a proper time, adequate remedial action has not been taken.

Storage Eggs for Fresh Ones.

Commissioner Dillon of the State Department of Foods and Markets has discovered that many wholesale concerns are dumping on retailers cold storage eggs which masquerade as "strictly fresh," and are charging "strictly fresh" prices for them. It is against the law to sell storage eggs unless they are known as such. Retailers are required to display signs declaring that they handle cold storage eggs if they have any for sale, and are forbidden to represent such edibles as newly laid or fresh. Mr. Dillon insists that he will enforce this law with prosecutions of violators.

It is to be hoped that he will carry out his duty thoroughly. The storage egg is a good marketable commodity and is worth buying—as such. It is not worth 50 or 60 cents a dozen, and it certainly should not be palmed off on any customer as "just from the farm." Co-operation between the authorities and the consumers, with much watchfulness on the part of both, could reduce the chance of success of this fraud to a minimum.

Pajama Parties.

There is a great deal aside from its euphony to recommend the "pajama party," which appears to be "coming in," as the fashion writers say. To begin with, it promises, temporarily at least, to substitute for the absurdly uncomfortable and inartistic evening dress of men and the increasingly immodest and equally uncomfortable evening gown of women a costume eminently suited for dancing, for dining; light, modest, unrestrictive, not inartistic. The universal association of pajamas with night wear gives to them now a certain naughty suggestiveness which may offend some hostesses while recommending them to others, but this is all pure habit of mind. If exposure of flesh and figure be any measure of immodesty, who is there who can condemn pajamas while accepting the low cut corsage and scanty, clinging skirt?

From an account of a "pajama party" recently given in South Orange we learn that host and hostess "were dressed as twins in costumes of white with trim bird decorations" (thus affording an added bond between husband and wife and possibly a not unimportant means of marital identification), while the guests "wore pajamas of varied hues and models." Pajamas, it can be seen, lend themselves to colors and combinations which convention or a sense of humor forbid in other garments; they may be fashioned, too, of the most delicate and exquisite materials. Clad in them, men may once more become butterflies instead of beetles for the purposes of polite gayety, and women may play about with the freedom of children. What more appropriate to the function of fashionable society, which, in Matthew Arnold's definition, attempts to reproduce in certain favored environments something of the Golden Age associated with humanity's beginnings?

And possibly their growing popularity as evening wear will gradually eliminate pajamas as night wear, which is as it should be. Or will the temptation to go to bed in one's evening clothes prove irresistible?

"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches," but even the name "Roosevelt" doesn't take the place of $25 in a New Jersey court.

Saving the cable tolls on the message to Great Britain is the supreme triumph of Democratic economy.

The Governor's budget conference has discovered 1,000 useless state jobs. Only 1,000?

A locked door makes a poor fire escape.

George Edwardes and Musical Comedy.

(From The Manchester Guardian.)

The death of George Edwardes is a fatal blow to musical comedy in London. His most serious and most intelligent rival, Robert Courtneidge, is committed to opera for some time to come, and it would not be in the least surprising if the musical comedy founded by Mr. Edwardes were to set just as English opera is beginning to rise. It is not, of course, that the two are mutually exclusive. There is room for serious and for light opera. But musical comedy was a danger to opera in so far as, being a paying and comparatively long established concern, it had a tendency to draw to itself singers whose right place is the opera stage. Webster Millar, the Manchester tenor, is an example in point. In musical comedy his fine voice and talent for dramatic expression were utterly thrown away, for the music of Mr. Edwardes's productions was as uninteresting and as little varied as their titles. This was the cause of the Edwardes failure to establish a type of entertainment which will endure. If he had possessed an ear for good music as well as the eye for scenic effects we might have had English light opera to supplement Lecocq and Offenbach. But he had not even the courage to search for the men to give him the kind of music he needed. Most of his musical comedies had music which was trivial without being in the least gay, while the quality of the comedy depended almost entirely on the skill of the performer.

How Ferdinand Got His Throne.

(From The Westminster Gazette.)

The story goes that when the Bulgarian envoys, twenty-eight years ago, had made an unsuccessful search, among the European royalties, for a ruler to fill the Bulgarian throne, and were sitting dejected in a Vienna café at the end of their pilgrimage, preparing to return home empty handed, an envoy of Ferdinand's mother, the Princess Clementine, approached them and called their attention to the young Prince, who was sitting at a neighboring table. "There is the man you want," he remarked to them; "a grandson of Louis Philippe, a favorite of Austria and the Czar; a man of wealth, and cousin to every crowned head in Europe." The envoys reported to Stambuloff, and he eagerly embraced the candidature of the young Prince. Ferdinand was then in his twenty-seventh year.

"GERMANY IS BEATEN"

The Parallel with Our Civil War Confirmed by an Old Soldier.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The editorial on "Germany Is Beaten" and the parallel of the Union army in the last year of the war was very illuminating and, from my experience, a correct comparison.

I had been fighting for three years, our army had met with many defeats, but never once had the idea found any volunteers who thought or voiced the word "beaten" or believed that the war was a failure. I had to come East to hear that the war was a failure, to see and hear the Copperheads and money-loving, dough-faced merchants asking for peace at any price, urging that we let our erring sister states go and pay for the slaves and damages.

McClellan and Vallandigham were running for President and Vice-President on the anti-war ticket, and the enemies of the Union were rioting and fighting the "draft." I was wounded and sent to a hospital in Brooklyn to make room in the hospitals for those who were more seriously wounded. I heard in many hotels and bars men drink success to Jeff Davis and the Confederacy. I saw officers and sailors from blockade runners paying for drinks (for all in the barroom) with gold. And the sentiments were: The Yankees are beaten.

I came nearer being killed for calling them traitors and cowards than I did at the front. I could not endure it. So I deserted the hospital and joined my regiment in front of Petersburg, Va., where we had the same stranglehold on the rebels that the Allies have on the Germans. Our navy had the same control of rebel ports that the Allies' navies have of all the German ports. The disloyal papers magnified our reverses and belittled our President and generals, and praised the South and encouraged them in every way. I remember a very popular song. One verse was:

> Tell the traitors all around you
> That their cruel works we know,
> In every fight they kill our soldiers
> By the help they give the foe.

Our army made many costly mistakes, but from Cold Harbor to Appomattox we knew we had them beaten, and they knew they were beaten. Yet after the fight at Five Forks I had charge of Lieutenant General Ewell and staff, and a more interesting night I never spent. General Ewell talked till morning, he was so excited. He had lost a leg at Bull Run, but the way he stumped up and down that tent that night I shall never forget. He finally excused himself for being so excited, saying it must be the strong coffee he had drunk. He was not used to such. He gave a synopsis of the war, where they failed, etc., saying: "If our foresight had only been as good as their hindsight we should have won."

The next day Lee surrendered. When I informed him of the report he said: "It is a lie—just another Yankee trick!" Finally he was convinced it was true. He said: "My corps was sacrificed to give Lee a chance to escape and unite with the Southwestern army, and the two armies under him were to defeat the West, then turn on Grant's army." He was a changed man. I sat at his foot. He had a charming personality. He looked at me with his piercing gray eyes, under bushy gray eyebrows, and asked very quietly: "Which prison would be the most free from visitors?" I said: "Dry Tortugas." He smiled and nodded, saying: "Yes, there would not be many visitors come there."

But I am glad that our nation was big enough to be generous to a brave and worthy (though rebellious) foe. The end came; the mighty armies were scattered to their homes, all glad the war was over. And the right prevailed. It was a blessing to the foe. So in this European upheaval and brilliant fighting the end will come, and the doctrine of "Might is right" will be buried—a blessing to all the world. "And blessed are the peacemakers." Amen. Captain WILLIAM H. MATHEWS.

Brooklyn, Nov. 4, 1915.

Educate Immigrants.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: New York City came near putting itself on record as being against the Americanization of its 2,000,000 foreign born, but fortunately we came to our senses and avoided this blunder by making a needed appropriation for continuing our night schools. Now the work of teaching our language and customs—in fact of transferring him from a liability to an asset—can be continued.

Yet we must remember that our work is just started, for New York, the melting pot of the country, stands low on the ladder of Americanization. Several cities, including Detroit, have increased their appropriations for the education of the immigrant, for they realize that the welfare of the community depends largely upon our new citizens. Twenty-six thousand, I think, is the number New York has lately made first voters.

In 1910 there were 421,951 foreign born persons two years of age or over in New York City proper who could not speak English, and 254,208 immigrants who could neither read nor write. And this means that these people can know very little about the laws, democratic ideals or welfare of our city or country.

Add to this number the 339,573 aliens of twenty-one years of age who have not taken out first citizenship papers, and one can see very plainly that our own wellbeing depends largely on the Americanization of our foreign element, for by mere force of numbers the immigrant is coming to control our politics and our social economic life.

To help the cause, I would here ask the aid of The Tribune in urging our Federal government through its Bureau of Education to publish a standard civic manual for the United States which can be successfully used in our day and night schools throughout the country. J. C. PUMPELLY.

New York, Nov. 7, 1915.

Birds and Cats Agree.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I was very glad to see in this morning's Tribune another letter in defence of the unfortunate cat. L. Underhill evidently understands them. Feed and treat your cats properly and they will not trouble the birds much.

We praise a cat for catching a mouse, scold her for catching a bird, when she knows no difference. Lovers of birds (and I consider myself one) can do much, with no bitter feeling toward the cats, to save the birds. I have at present two cats and three half-grown kittens on the place, and also many starlings. Every morning and evening the starlings and sparrows come to bathe in a large pan of water that is filled for them twice a day.

My one house cat seldom catches birds, or if he does lets them go again, but the other cat and three kittens having been homeless till I took them in watched the birds. So, fearing for my starlings, I had an iron pipe five or six feet long cemented into the ground, a board fastened on top and the pan of water placed on it. Now, my starlings come and bathe and never mind the cats. They know they are safe and the cats are free and happy. HELEN WESTON.

Livingston, Staten Island, Nov. 6, 1915.

HANDS OFF CHINA!

The Chinese Should Be Free to Choose Their Own Form of Government—Great Progress Already Made Along Republican Lines.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The newspapers have been so crowded with war news and politics recently that the proclamation on October 23 of a new peace and arbitration treaty between the United States and China seems to have escaped the attention it deserved. This treaty agreement is the seventeenth of its kind in effect between the United States and foreign nations providing arbitration for the settlement of international disputes. Similar treaties with thirteen other foreign countries have been agreed upon, and only the details of ratification are pending.

For half a century there has been a kindly feeling between the governments and peoples of the United States and of China; in fact, this sentiment has developed into a warm friendship. This was evidenced when the United States returned to China some $18,000,000 from the Boxer War indemnity fund. China has reciprocated by using a considerable portion of this money to educate Chinese students in the educational institutions of the United States. There are nearly a thousand of these Chinese men and women attending the universities, technical and preparatory schools of the United States. A Chinese graduate of Cornell is Ambassador to Great Britain, and Dr. Koo, a renowned international lawyer, a graduate of Columbia, has recently been made Chinese Minister to the United States. These educational exchanges are significant and promising for international amity.

The attitude of the people of the United States has been decidedly against any attempt on the part of any nation or any combination of nations to partition China or weaken it as either empire or republic.

Since the European war began one section of China under lease to a foreign nation, has been invaded and captured as a war prize by another foreign nation. To accomplish this the home territory of China was invaded against her protest and a foreign army marched across this territory in violation of international law and treaty agreements. With Europe in the turmoils of war and China struggling through its transition period from monarchy to republic, new complications have arisen, both domestic and external, which may force China to revert to a monarchy in order to save her sovereignty and prevent the partition of her territory. While all the world is interested in this event, the republics of the world are especially interested in preserving, if possible, the republican principle for ultimate realization by China.

China has made wonderful progress during the last three years along republican lines. She has established an equitable system of taxation, which has been successfully administered. This has been a great object lesson for the people of China and farreaching in its educational effects. The republican principle has been exemplified even in the proposal to change the republic to a monarchy in that Yuan Shih-kai, the President, has referred the matter in a direct referendum to the people for determination as to whether they will change their form of government to a monarchy. This in itself is a triumph for the republican principle.

It is maintained by some that the chief reason for reverting to the monarchical system is because of external dangers that menace the republic and the Chinese people. The pressure brought to bear on China in recent treaty negotiations with Japan has brought home to the people the necessity for and the advantage of a strong central government and an adequate defence for the preservation of the integrity of China from both domestic and foreign foes.

It is a matter for congratulation that the United States and France have just declined to join with certain foreign nations in "advising" China not to change her present form of government. Whatever individual views and interests may inspire, let us assume that the Chinese people know the form of government that will best conform to their needs.

The China Society of America was organized to foster and encourage good will between the people of China and the United States, and we appeal to the people of the United States for fair play toward China. It is for this purpose that we ask the people of the United States to give due consideration to China's difficulties and to see that she shall have a fair chance to develop her social and political institutions along lines that seem best to her, without outside interference, except in such manner as may help her to establish the good government and peace she desires.

The Chinese people respond readily to the spirit of justice and fairness, and are renowned throughout the world for their honesty in commercial dealings. In the interest of justice, humanity and world welfare for all nations and peoples, why not give China a chance? ANDREW B. HUMPHREY.

Chairman, the China Society of America.

New York, Nov. 6, 1915.

"Muddlers Defiant."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am a constant reader of your editorials on the war and am an admirer of the lucidity and the style in which they are couched. However, admiration for these qualities cannot blind one to the fact that the writer in his latest effort seems to take a somewhat unjust view of the British Premier and also not to grasp with thorough understanding the situation in which England finds herself.

That England was in an unprepared state previous to the Teutonic outburst certainly showed shortsightedness, but also presupposed a belief in human nature for which there was more justification than there is at the present moment. This country should remember that fact, and also that England entered into the war with no more excuse than America has to-day.

That was the situation. The Liberal Ministry had not only to create a machine of unheard of size, but also to rush it into working order. Mr. Asquith has been the victim of political intrigue rather than the instigator thereof. Thwarted by the cupidity of would-be officeholders, harassed by the bickerings of disappointed men of the Milner-Beresford type, and beset by the howling of the Northcliffe press, he is nevertheless keeping his head and maintaining a firm grasp on the helm. The wonder is not that mistakes should have been made, but that more mistakes were not made.

At any rate, when the ravisher of Belgium is brought to his knees, as surely will happen, the courage and coolness of the Premier will have no small share of the honor. Posterity will yet place his name on the tablets of fame, together with those of Pitt, Gladstone and Disraeli. W. L. S.

New York, Nov. 8, 1915.

Back in the Fold.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read with interest the letter from Jan Merriman about cancelling his subscription on account of your advanced stand in favor of our women. My family, too, are old subscribers to The Tribune, and I am pleased to again be within the fold, after "wandering in the wilderness," so to speak, for some time.

You are only following the best traditions of The Tribune in indorsing real democracy. How proud (?) the antis must be that it was the saving grace of the corrupt political machines in Philadelphia that kept Pennsylvania from leading the march of progress in the East last Tuesday. It was a great victory for suffrage that this great state gave a majority for the amendment outside of Philadelphia. All honor to the million and a quarter men in the four campaign states who stood with the women in their unequal fight for suffrage! It means the dawn is breaking for them, and that soon.

WILLIAM F. AIKEN.

Greenfield, Mass., Nov. 8, 1915.

An Effective Blockade.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Not an effective blockade! And on the day this is declared Ambassador Gerard writes from Berlin to ask that England raise her blockade sufficiently to let through a pair of shoes for the ambassadorial feet.

JOHN KNUCKLES.

New York, Nov. 8, 1915.

AMATEURISH DEFENCE PLANS

A "Non-Professional" Army No Help in Time of National Need.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: After the passage of the Democratic free trade tariff measure manufacturers who protested that they could not compete with cheap European labor were advised by President Wilson to become more efficient, to whet their wits against the wits of foreign manufacturers. The Secretary of Commerce has frequently repeated this consoling advice. Efficiency comes from training men to be expert in their several fields of labor.

In view of all this, what are we to think of the following paragraph, occurring in the President's address on preparedness at the Manhattan Club:

"What we all wish to accomplish is that the forces of the nation should indeed be part of the nation and not a separate professional force, and the chief cost of the system would not be in the enlistment or in the training of the men, but in the providing of ample equipment in case it should be necessary to call all forces into the field."

An efficient army, capable of opposing successfully an invading force of a European power, must not, according to the President, consist of enlisted men or trained men, but of comparatively raw citizens, with no knowledge of military tactics beyond drilling for "a very brief period of each year," to use Mr. Wilson's own words. There must be "ample equipment," however. Could any suggestion be more supremely ridiculous? If it came from just an ordinary citizen, instead of the President of the United States, it would be laughed at. Of what value is "ample equipment" in the hands of men who wouldn't know how to use it—who, if they could even fire a rifle, wouldn't be able to hit a barn door at fifty yards? Is Mr. Wilson so profoundly ignorant of military matters as to believe that men, who would not have training enough to comprehend the manual of arms could stand for a moment before, for instance, German veterans?

Mr. Wilson recognizes that an efficient navy is necessary. What would be thought of a suggestion that the increase in the personnel of the navy in time of war be made up of men who had served on warships a "very brief period of each year." Such ill-trained men could not handle the big guns, and would be of no use in an emergency. Is this idea of practically untrained men for the navy any more absurd than the President's suggestions with respect to a citizen army?

It is discouraging to feel that we, as a nation, are compelled to lean upon and expect protection from such a slender reed as now occupies the White House, with his "too proud to fight" notions. We must not, Mr. Wilson says, have a "professional force," by which he means a regular army, trained to such efficiency, for instance, as prevails in Germany. And why not, pray? Doesn't he know that any other kind of soldiers would be useless in time of invasion? Has he forgotten the sorry plight the so-called Continental Army was in during the Revolutionary War until Baron Steuben licked it into some sort of shape the winter it spent at Valley Forge? If Washington could appear in our midst to-day, would he tell us we must have no trained soldiers? When he advised the nation, in his last words, in time of peace to prepare for war, was he thinking of "citizenry" or minute men, or real soldiers.

It is difficult for an intelligent citizen to consider the programme of the administration on preparedness with any degree of patience. Mr. Wilson's plan is merely a makeshift, and a poor one at that.

We ought to have a regular army of not less than 250,000 men, so that in case of necessity we could mobilize within a week at least 150,000 trained soldiers. Our navy should be superior to that of any other, except Great Britain, which we could not hope to rival, and there would be no reason why we should, as the United States is in no danger from an attack by England.

Let us pray that the Creator of all things will take care of us until the Republicans once more gain control of the country, for we are not likely to get help from any other source. M. T. R.

New York, Nov. 8, 1915.